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1. THE PUZZLE OF RESTRICTED LOCATIVE CASES

Latin: names of towns, cities, small islands and a few common nouns including domus/domi ‘home’, rus/ruri ‘countryside’ and humus/humi ‘ground’ have locative (essive) case.

(1) a. iacère humi
lie.INF ground.LOC
to lie on the ground

b. Mīlitēs Albae cōnstitērun in urbe opportūnā.
soldiers Alba.LOC halted in city.ABL convenient.ABL
The soldiers halted at Alba, a conveniently situated town.

Cannot be a morphological restriction on the distribution of the locative case suffix (which is syncretic with other cells in the paradigm anyway): exactly the same set of lexical items uses bare accusative case-marking for allative and bare ablative case-marking for the source:

(2) a. Missī lēgātī Athēnās sunt.
sent.PL envoys Athens.ACC are
Envoys were sent to Athens.

b. Innumerābīlēs (philosophī) numquam domum revertērunt.
innumerable philosophers never home.ACC returned
Innumerable philosophers never returned home

(3) a. (Verrēs) omnia domō ēius abstulit.
Verres everything house.ABL his took.away
Verres took everything away from his house.

b. Dolābella Dēlō proficīscitur.
Dolabella Delos.ABL depart
Dolabella sets out from Delos.

The null preposition hypothesis would require the preposition to l-select its complement

It turns out that locative cases frequently have restricted distribution:

(4) a. locative case restricted to toponyms and/or some common nouns (T&sCN)

b. locative case-marking optional or absent for T&sCN

[...]

c. special locative case forms for T&sCN
[...]

d. locative cases & genitive only for T&sCN
[...]

Semantic solution: some toponyms and common nouns can denote loci rather than entities
2. **Latin restricted locative as a locus**

Many different technical approaches to the semantics of spatial prepositions (Bierwisch 1988, Wunderlich 1991, Zwarts and Winter 2000, Kracht 2002, Bateman, Hois, Ross and Tenbrink 2010, etc.). All agree: **spatial prepositions operate with loci** (regions, sets of points, sets of vectors, etc.)

Core intuition: if an NP already denotes a locus, the (locative) preposition is not necessary

**Restricted locatives in Latin denote loci**, which is why they do not need a preposition


(5) a. Multos annos Gallia **sub imperio Romano** fuit.
   many years Gaul **under rule** Roman
   For many years Gaul was under Roman rule.

b. **Sub imperium Romanum** Gallia cecidit.
   under rule Roman Gaul fall
   Gaul fell under the Roman rule.

Reasonable assumption: the accusative of direction results from the presence of an additional functional head Path (Koopman 2000, Zwarts 2005, Svenonius 2008, 2010, den Dikken 2010, etc.) or from [motion] on M (Radkevich 2010) for both bare and prepositional locatives

3. **Cross-linguistic implications of locus-denoting NPs**

The availability of locus denotation explains **locative pronouns and demonstratives** (there)

No need to assume complex internal structure if they denote loci (cf. the French en and y)

Assuming that some NPs can denote loci explains the cross-linguistic restrictions on locative cases on the assumption that **locative cases can have different functions across languages**:

(6) a. locative case-marking restricted to T&SCN only these denote loci (as in Latin)

b. locative case-marking optional or absent for T&SCN only these T&SCN denote loci; for all others locative case-marking indicates the presence of a null preposition that assigns it

c. special locative case forms for T&SCN only these T&SCN denote loci, as in (4/6a). For all others the default locative case results from the presence of a null preposition, as in (4/6b)

d. locative cases & genitive only for T&SCN these denote loci only with no corresponding entity-correlates (the morpheme for EIGEN * is not available)

The complementary case-marking in languages like (4a) vs. (4b) shows that the locative-case label cannot correspond to the same structure across languages

Creary, Gawron and Nerbonne 1989 (building on Jackendoff 1983, cf. Larson 1987): just as NP arguments can be pronominalized, quantified over and give rise to ACD, so can locatives:

(7) a. Bill sang **everywhere** Mary sang/did.

b. Al lives on the Ohio, and Ed works **there**.
Bonus: the appositive genitive (the city of New York) explained, diachronically at least
Extra bonus: bare NP-adverbials (e.g., Monday) may be temporal loci

4. **The source of locative and the nature of case**

Case (informal definition): **nominal morphology reflecting the environment of the NP**

Marantz 1991:
- lexical (assigned by a particular head, e.g., quirky or adpositional)
- dependent (accusative and ergative, cf. Baker and Vinokurova 2010 et seq.)
- unmarked (nominative and absolutive in a clause, genitive in an NP)
- default (realization of the lack of case)

Standard formalization: **dedicated case features**
- unintuitive: how does [accusative] correlate with v? Why should it?
- non-morphological: how does syncretism work?
- non-universal: how can [accusative] differ in English and in Russian?
- too categorical: how can there be several variants of [genitive] in one language?

**Alternative:** case as a reflection of other features

Pesetsky and Torrego 2001 (see also Williams 1994, Haeberli 1999): nominative is T (i.e., there is no feature [nominative], there is [uT])
Pesetsky and Torrego 2004 (see also Kratzer 1996, Torrego 2002, Travis 2010): accusative is v ([uT] on v₀)
Bailyn 2004: genitive is Q
Pesetsky 2013: **genitive is [uN], nominative is [uD], accusative is [uV]**


Two potential sources for the locative case: a reflection of the **internal semantics** ([ilocus], like the feminine gender on mother) or assignment by a **functional head** ([uF]: which F?)

**4.1. Locative as a reflex of an interpretable feature**

Case-assignment and its overt realization can be conditional on interpretable features (e.g., differential object and subject marking; accusative syncretism for inanimates, etc.)

The locative case morphology can be analyzed as the realization of the interpretable feature [locus]. In which case locative is arguably **a case that is not assigned**

Advantages of this view: no null functional heads, cf. inherent cases (Woolford 2001, 2006)
Disadvantage: case is not uniformly assigned from the outside

**4.2. A null functional head in locatives**

As prepositions express relations between loci, we minimally need the semantic **type for loci** and a function to **map an entity to its locus**

Wunderlich 1991: the **eigenspace** of an entity is the region that it occupies (obtained by the application of the primitive function EIGEN)

A preposition applies to a locus (e.g., a set of points) and returns another locus

\[(8) \quad \text{the TV} \quad \text{EIGEN ([the TV])} \quad \text{above (EIGEN ([the TV]))} \]
This is obviously a simplification, as much more syntactic and semantic complexity has been proposed for PPs (Zwarts and Winter 2000: vector spaces; Koopman 2000, Zwarts 2005, Den Dikken 2010: Path; Svenonius 2008, 2010: Deg and K; Radkevich 2010: M, etc.)

Open question: does \textit{EIGEN} have a structural representation? (Svenonius 2008, 2010: K)

Locative PPs can function as modifiers of entities (NP-externally) or events (VP-externally):

\begin{enumerate}
  \item a. a house in New York
  \item b. to live/walk in New York
\end{enumerate}

For the former case, direct composition is impossible; \textbf{must shift from a locus} (however it is defined) to a set of entities (type \langle e, t \rangle). A very reasonable assumption for the latter case as well

Hence \textit{EIGEN}: maps a locus to the set of entities (type \langle e, t \rangle) that are located at this locus:

\begin{equation}
\textit{EIGEN}^{-} = \text{def} \lambda l . \lambda x . \text{EIGEN} (x) \subseteq l
\end{equation}

\textit{EIGEN}^{-} \textbf{cannot be a lexical part of spatial prepositions}, since spatial PPs can be augmented by directional prepositions and modified:

\begin{enumerate}
  \item a. [[six feet] behind the house]
  \item b. [from under the bed]
\end{enumerate}

The measure phrase and the directional preposition do not combine with something of the type \langle e, t \rangle

Which means that the transition to the predicate type happens at a higher level and can be accomplished by a functional head (the p^o of Svenonius 2003, cf. Kratzer 1996 for v^o)

Svenonius 2003: the case assigned to the Ground is assigned by p^o+p^o (or p^o alone), cf. v^o

Individual Ps can assign \textbf{quirky cases}. If not, p^o accounts for the \textbf{default prepositional case} (cf. Haselbach and Pitteroff 2015)

Reconciliation with the decomposition in Kracht 2002 and Radkevich 2010: directional PPs do not comprise the totality of the locative tree (because directionals do not need to include the pP, a different mode of composition is expected)

5. \textbf{CONCLUSION AND FURTHER QUESTIONS}

A set of cross-linguistic generalizations about restrictions on preposition-less locative case argues for adopting locus denotations for some terminals in some languages

As our ontology at any rate requires loci, it is unsurprising that there should be terminals that denote loci

Loci naturally have entity-correlates:

\begin{equation}
\textit{EIGEN}^{+}: \text{maps a locus to the unique entity located at this locus} \\
\lambda l . \lambda x . \text{EIGEN} (x) = l
\end{equation}

Two points of variation:

\begin{itemize}
  \item whether a language has locus-denoting nouns at all
  \item whether each given locative case (form) indicates the presence of more structure (when corresponding to a hidden preposition) or less (when corresponding to the default case-marking on lexical loci)
\end{itemize}
(Potential) extensions:

- attested locative case syncretisms (Radkevich 2010): only directional/locative and ablative/locative (in Nivkh and Veps)
- the effect of modification (restrictive vs. non-restrictive)
- unmarked definite locatives (Rapa Nui (Kieviet 2017), Modern Greek (Ioannidou and Dikken 2009, Terzi 2010, Gehrke and Lekakou 2012), Western Armenian)
- Russian close apposition with toponyms (Matushansky 2013, in progress)
- temporal loci (e.g., \textit{Monday, next week})
- connection between \(p^\circ\) and \(\text{Pred}^\circ\)

The issue of multiple case-assignment and multiple case-marking: \textbf{which case wins?}


\textbf{Decompositional} (Jakobsonian) approach to case + the reflexive nature of case features
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